DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 822 HE 000 435

Governance Of Public Higher Education In California.

Spons Agency-Academy for Educational Development, Inc., New York, N.Y.; California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Sacramento.

Report No-R-1033

Pub Date Oct 68

Note-114p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.80

Descriptors-*Educational Planning, *Governance, *Higher Education, *Institutional Administration, Junior Colleges, *Master Plans, State Colleges, State Universities

Identifiers-*California

The report, prepared by the Academy for Educational Development as part of an extensive review of California's 1959 Master Plan for Higher Education, contains recommendations for the future governance of public higher education in California. Eight alternative systems of governance (including the present system) are examined in an attempt to select the one that would resolve most of the immediate problems facing higher education in the state. Fourteen criteria were formulated to serve as a framework within which the overall analysis was made, and as the basis for appraising the advantages and disadvantages of the 8 plans. The existing public higher education system consists of 3 independent public segments (universities, colleges, and junior colleges), coordinated by a statewide board with primarily advisory powers. The recommended system would have 2 independent public segments, one containing all public institutions granting baccalaureate and graduate degrees (colleges and universities), and another granting only associate degrees (junior colleges), coordinated by a statewide board. It is felt that this system would, among other things, simplify the financial structure and remove arbitrary barriers to development. The establishment of regional committees for furthering interinstitutional cooperation is also suggested, as well as advisory boards for keeping abreast of problems and needs of each 4-year campus. (WM)

ED027822

(2

GOVERNANCE OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Report Prepared by
The Academy for
Educational
Development, Inc.

HE000435

COORDINATING
COUNCIL for
HIGHER
EDUCATION

Number 1033
October, 1968

COORDINATING COUNCIL FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

October, 1968

COUNCIL MEMBERS

GENERAL PUBLIC REPRESENTATIVES

Dr. GEORGE GELMAN	Bakersfield
Mr. LORENZO N. HOOPES	Oakland
Mr. ROBERT A. HORNBY	Los Angeles
Mr. PATTERSON N. HYNDMAN	La Mesa
Mr. KENNETH R. REARWIN	San Diego

PRIVATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES REPRESENTATIVES

Dr. WILLIAM C. BARK	Professor of History, Stanford University
Dr. GEORGE C. S. BENSON	President, Claremont Men's College
Rev. CHARLES S. CASASSA, S. J.	President, Loyola University of Los Angeles

COMMUNITY COLLEGES REPRESENTATIVES

Dr. SIDNEY W. BROSSMAN	Chancellor, California Community Colleges
Mr. JAMES C. DODD	Member, Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges
Mrs. CAROL W. MARSDEN	Member, Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES REPRESENTATIVES

Dr. GLENN S. DUMKE	Chancellor of the State Colleges
Mr. LOUIS H. HEILBRON	Trustee
Mr. CHARLES I. LUCKMAN	Trustee

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA REPRESENTATIVES

Mrs. ELINOR HELLER	Regent
Mr. DE WITT A. HIGGS	Regent
Mr. CHARLES J. HITCH	President of the University

COUNCIL OFFICERS

Rev. CHARLES S. CASASSA, S. J.	President
Mr. KENNETH R. REARWIN	Vice President

SPECIAL NOTE

The study of Governance of Public Higher Education in California was commissioned by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education in the Spring of 1968 as part of an extensive review of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California which was developed in 1959.

In October, 1968, the Council transmitted without comment the Governance study to the Governor, the Legislature, the Constitution Revision Commission and to the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State Colleges and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. In transmitting the study of Governance, neither the Council nor its staff in any way approved the recommendations included therein.

The Academy for Educational Development, Inc., which prepared the study as a consultant to the Council, was selected by the Council Director after consideration of proposals from other educational consulting groups and in light of the Academy's past record of performance.

The Academy is a non-profit, tax-exempt corporation which performs studies and other investigations relative to all aspects of education. For example, the Academy has prepared master plans or similar studies for the State of Kansas, the Ohio Board of Regents, the Pennsylvania State Board of Education, the Missouri Governor's Conference on Education, the Advisory Commission for the Higher Education Study of the State of Maine, the Colorado Commission on Higher Education, and to the Higher Education Aid Advisory Commission of Delaware. The Academy has recently been selected to perform a major investigation by the U. S. Office of Education concerning planning for higher education on a national basis.

PANEL MEMBERS AND STAFF FOR THE ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.

Panel

ALVIN C. EURICH, President, Academy for Educational Development (Chairman).

CHESTER M. ALTER, Educational Consultant; formerly Chancellor, University of Denver; formerly Dean, Boston University Graduate School.

HARVIE BRANSCOMB, Educational Consultant; formerly Chancellor, Vanderbilt University.

THEODORE M. LEVITT, Professor, Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration.

HERMAN B WELLS, Acting President and Chancellor, Indiana University; formerly President, Indiana University.

Staff Director

REXFORD G. MOON, JR., Director of Studies, Academy for Educational Development.

N. B. Dr. Branscomb served also as Field Director for this study.

JOHN F. MERRIAM
Chairman of the Executive
Committee, Northern Natural
Gas Company; Chairman,
Business Education Committee,
Committee for Economic
Development.

NEWTON N. MINOW
Senior Partner, Leibman,
Williams, Bennett, Baird
and Minow.
Formerly Chairman, Federal
Communications Commission.

JAMES O'BRIEN
Vice President and Director
Standard Oil Company of California.

The Academy for Educational Development is a nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation serving schools, colleges, universities, government agencies, foundations, and other public and private organizations concerned with education or desiring to develop educational plans for the future.

New York
437 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022
(212) 758-5454

Washington, D.C.
1424 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 265-5576

Denver
820 Sixteenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202
(303) 244-9258

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.

Officers and Directors

SAMUEL M. BROWNELL, Chairman
Professor of Urban Educational Administration, Yale University Graduate School.
Formerly United States Commissioner of Education and Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, Michigan.

ALVIN C. EURICH, President
Chairman, Educational Research and Development Division, Famous Artists Schools; Senior Consultant for Professional Affairs, Academy for Religion and Mental Health.
Formerly President, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies; President, State University of New York; Vice President and Director, Fund for the Advancement of Education; Executive Director, Ford Foundation Education Program; Vice President and Acting President, Stanford University; Chairman, Stanford Research Institute.

SIDNEY G. TICKTON, Vice President and Treasurer
Director of various studies being conducted by the Academy for Educational Development.
Formerly Program Associate, Ford Foundation Education Program; Manager, Technical Services for Beardsley Ruml; Assistant Director of Research, Treasury Department.

JOSEPH S. ISEMAN, Secretary
Partner, Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison.

ROBERT O. ANDERSON
Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer, Atlantic Richfield Company.

FAIRFAX M. CONE
Chairman, Board of Trustees, University of Chicago; Founder and Director, Foote, Cone & Belding.

GILBERT GRANET
President, Famous Artists Schools.

ROBERT V. HANSBERGER
President, Boise Cascade Corporation.

THEODORE LEVITT
Professor of Business Administration, Harvard University Graduate School of Business Administration.

FRED LUDEKENS
Chairman of the Board, Famous Artists Schools.

HERBERT R. MAYES
Director and Consultant, McCall Corporation; Director, Saturday Review.
Formerly President, McCall Corporation.

JAMES A. MC CAIN
President, Kansas State University.

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON GOVERNANCE OF PUBLIC HIGHER EDUCATION

This Committee was appointed by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education to provide advisory assistance to the Academy in the conduct of the study and in the preparation of this report. The Committee is not responsible in any way for the contents of the report or the recommendations of the Panel.

WILLARD SPALDING, Deputy Director, Coordinating Council on Higher Education (Chairman).

EARL C. BOLTON, Vice President-Administration, University of California.

SOL BUCHALTER, Chairman, Academic Senate, California State Colleges.

O. JAMES GIBSON, Special Assistant to the Governor, Governor's Office.

CLINTON M. JORDAN, Principal Administrative Analyst, Legislative Budget Committee.

C. MANSEL KEENE, Assistant Chancellor, Faculty and Staff Affairs, California State Colleges.

FRANK KIDNER, Vice President-Educational Relations, University of California.

ARCHIE L. MC PHERRAN, Staff, Board of Governors, California Community Colleges.

MORGAN ODELL, Executive Director, Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities.

CONTENTS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

INTRODUCTION 1

ALTERNATIVES AND CRITERIA 8

ALTERNATIVE I - THE PRESENT SYSTEM 16

ALTERNATIVE II - A COUNCIL OR BOARD WITH AUTHORITY IN SPECIFIED AREAS 31

ALTERNATIVE III - A FOURTH PUBLIC SEGMENT 45

ALTERNATIVE IV - A REGIONAL ORGANIZATION 51

ALTERNATIVE V - TWO SEGMENTS: THE CONSOLIDATED UNIVERSITY AND THE JUNIOR COLLEGES 62

ALTERNATIVE VI - A SINGLE BOARD FOR ALL PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS 76

ALTERNATIVE VII - AN ENLARGED UNIVERSITY SEGMENT 81

ALTERNATIVE VIII - GOVERNING BOARDS FOR EACH INSTITUTION 84

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION 92

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.
437 MADISON AVENUE
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022
(212) 758-5454

September 1, 1968

Dr. Owen A. Knorr
Director
Coordinating Council for Higher Education
State of California
1020 Twelfth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Dr. Knorr:

As the Panel appointed by the Academy to prepare recommendations for the Coordinating Council on the future governance of public higher education in California, we are pleased to offer this report. Our investigations were carried out in California and elsewhere in the nation from May through August of 1968. While we would have liked a longer and more convenient time, we feel our report does contain the insights you seek in planning for the future of the coordination of public higher education in California.

We have, as you asked us to do, examined various alternatives for the future governance of public higher education. There are a great many alternatives which we could have considered. We chose for study those which seemed to us to hold the greatest promise for contributing to a strong public higher education system in the years ahead. These have been studied in relation to broad criteria and in consideration of the situation in California as we understood it. Of necessity this report and our recommendations are based heavily upon our collective judgment and those of the consultants and staff working with us.

In conversations with the Council staff and the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee, it was agreed that we could, if we desired, make a specific recommendation concerning that alternative which, in our combined judgment, seemed to offer the best arrangement for the future. We have decided to do so.

We did not take on this assignment without being fully aware of the leadership position which California holds nationally and internationally in higher education. Certainly among the colleges and universities of the world -- public and private -- there are few if any equal to the University of California.

The State College System is the largest of its kind in the nation. The California Junior Colleges are the envy of and the model for the other 49 states. Among the private institutions are some of the greatest in the nation. These factors made our assignment most interesting and our responsibility awesome.

The report rests on many interviews with individuals in California associated with education and knowledgeable on the subject -- educators, regents and trustees, state officers, political leaders, and interested lay citizens. These interviews were held against a background of conversations with educators of national distinction and officials engaged in coordinating agencies of other states. A letter requesting information from the presidents of all colleges and universities in California supplemented the interviews and assured all that they would have an opportunity to express their views. Of the 191 receiving letters from us, 72 responded. Also the writings of a number of scholars in the field, including T. R. McConnell, John Millett, Lyman Glenny, John Smart, James Paltridge, Alan Cartter, Arthur Coons, proved very helpful as did recent reports prepared by the Council, the Joint Legislative Committee, and the Governor's Committee on Cost and Efficiency in Government.

Only because of the assistance given by Council staff members, the helpfulness of many members of the Council, and the excellent cooperation of many presidents, chancellors, and deans of colleges and universities were we able to complete this assignment on schedule. Many others throughout the nation were generous of their time and helpful with ideas. To all we express our sincere appreciation for their support.

We believe and hope that this report will contribute in some measure to continued and successful shaping of California's system of higher education.

Sincerely,

Alvin C. Eurich (Chairman)
Chester M. Alter
Harvie Branscomb
Theodore M. Levitt
Herman B Wells

The State College System is the largest of its kind in the nation. The California Junior Colleges are the envy of and the model for the other 49 states. Among the private institutions are some of the greatest in the nation. These factors made our assignment most interesting and our responsibility awesome.

The report rests on many interviews with individuals in California associated with education and knowledgeable on the subject -- educators, regents and trustees, state officers, political leaders, and interested lay citizens. These interviews were held against a background of conversations with educators of national distinction and officials engaged in coordinating agencies of other states. A letter requesting information from the presidents of all colleges and universities in California supplemented the interviews and assured all that they would have an opportunity to express their views. Of the 191 receiving letters from us, 72 responded. Also the writings of a number of scholars in the field, including T. R. McConnell, John Millett, Lyman Glenny, John Smart, James Paltridge, Alan Cartter, Arthur Coons, proved very helpful as did recent reports prepared by the Council, the Joint Legislative Committee, and the Governor's Committee on Cost and Efficiency in Government.

Only because of the assistance given by Council staff members, the helpfulness of many members of the Council, and the excellent cooperation of many presidents, chancellors, and deans of colleges and universities were we able to complete this assignment on schedule. Many others throughout the nation were generous of their time and helpful with ideas. To all we express our sincere appreciation for their support.

We believe and hope that this report will contribute in some measure to continued and successful shaping of California's system of higher education.

Sincerely,

Alvin C. Eurich (Chairman)
Chester M. Alter
Harvie Branscomb
Theodore M. Levitt
Herman B Wells

INTRODUCTION

Alternative plans for the governance of public higher education in California are reviewed in this report. The benefits, efficiency, responsiveness, administrative viability, as well as the disadvantages of various alternatives are examined, but only with the degree of certainty that humans can achieve and arrive at rational alternatives when objective evidence is minimal or nonexistent.

Logan Wilson stated the problem well when he said:

> A current difficulty in choosing sensibly among the alternatives available for the expansion and improvement of educational opportunity is our lack of objective knowledge about the possible consequences of such alternatives . . .

Governance is a broad term. It includes a consideration of structure -- the forms and arrangements through which governing takes place. It also includes a consideration of process -- the policies, means, methods, and procedures by which governing is carried out. Both of these aspects of governance contribute to the accomplishment of the ends which education is expected to serve. There is no guarantee that these ends will be so served, of course, even by the most perfect form of organization without the concurrence of other factors. Structure and process affect each other as well. The problem of structure, however, would seem to come first when new approaches are being considered, and it is to this aspect of governance that this report is addressed.

Ultimately governance of public institutions of higher education in the United States is the responsibility of the legislatures of the various states. This responsibility cannot be evaded, since legislatures are accountable for the use of funds collected under their taxing authority. Immediate responsibility for the administration and direction of these institutions must of necessity, however, be assigned, with proper reservations, to other agencies or bodies. The traditional American pattern has been to establish boards of citizens to be responsible for each institution.

American colleges and universities inherited from their European predecessors the concept of autonomy which they have more or less maintained in a modified Americanized form. In the earlier institutions, physically isolated from each other, and in most cases with each largely responsible for its own activities, autonomous conditions stimulated institutional responsibility, developed strong loyalties, created much support for the institution, and encouraged institutional initiative to provide new services and activities.

The forces of change, however, ended the period of comfortable isolation, if it indeed was comfortable. The growth in population, the increasing percentage of young people seeking some form of post-secondary education, and the multiplication of types of training needed for a complex society vastly increased the numbers of students and institutions, and enlarged suddenly and greatly the public responsibility for higher education. Legislatures were faced with requests and problems for which they had neither the time nor the specialized knowledge to settle or resolve. Higher education continued to seek an increasing percentage of state funds. As a result, legislatures found it increasingly difficult to deal with colleges and universities as separate units, each with its own proponents, special arguments, and self-determined needs.

Such developments ran parallel with other areas of state government, which led to increased clarification of methods for state public administration. Legislatures began to organize the various state activities and agencies with related functions into larger units, to place them under single administrative or reviewing agencies, defining clearly the lines of authority between these agencies and the executive and legislative branches of the government. Obviously higher education could not be left out of this process.

Another factor has been at work. The public has come to regard higher education not only as an individual right and an economic requirement, but also as an instrument for dealing with problems of technological and social change. Colleges and universities are being looked to for solutions to problems which a generation earlier would not have been regarded as their responsibility. The educational system is being called upon to respond to emerging national needs, to "fill gaps," to solve social as well as economic problems.

With these pressures it is not surprising that most of the states have created a central organization or agency to deal with the inter-related and over-all problems of higher education for planning and administrative purposes. In most states where formal agencies do not exist, plans are under consideration for their establishment. Three states have relied upon voluntary associations for coordination and planning, but in the case of the best known and most effective of these, Indiana, a committee is planning for an organization with statutory authority.

The California Coordinating Council for Higher Education was set up in 1960. Many forces and influences required such a council. California was on the verge of becoming the most populous state in the Union. Student enrollment was soaring. The California economy was developing rapidly, with new technologies appearing. Pressures for expansion were coming from many directions. In 1959, 23 bills, three resolutions and two constitutional amendments, all dealing with higher education, were introduced into the California Legislature. The need for some mechanism to provide expert and impartial advice to the Legislature and to serve as its agent in dealing with many of the specific problems of higher education was recognized on all sides.

The Master Plan, with its various provisions for the coordination of higher education, was the product of the Liaison Committee of the Board of Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education. There was also strong support for the Plan by state officials and members of the Legislature. There was virtually universal agreement that the situation called for a rational plan for the development of California's resources in higher education and that more consistent and formal guidance of its progress than provided by the earlier voluntary Liaison Committee was required.

In spite of a recognized record of accomplishment on the part of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education during its eight years of service, many of the problems of 1960 remain; new ones have also appeared. Student enrollment continues to mount. California has become the most populous and most affluent state in the Union. Technology has become an even more marked characteristic of the state's economy, with new professions and subprofessions calling for training and certification. California has had its problems with urban congestion, unrest, and decay. The underprivileged groups in society have demanded attention to their special needs. Unrest on the campuses has created internal problems and new public attitudes. Everywhere the methods, organization, and even goals of higher education are being questioned in California as elsewhere in the nation. Change is in the air. It is no reflection upon the authors of the Master Plan, or those charged subsequently with carrying out its provisions, that after nearly a decade of usefulness it becomes desirable to review some of its provisions. The Plan, in fact, called for periodic reviews.

Although the Panel is familiar with the coordination plans and systems which have been adopted in other states, the answers to the needs of California cannot be imported ready-made. It is worth noting that the plans which have been adopted elsewhere show much variation. "An ideal administrative model for state coordination of higher education is not now known," is one observer's summary of these state plans. Much seems to depend upon the size and wealth of the state, the number of institutions involved, and the stage of development of the higher education institutions. Each state also has its unique problems and traditions, many of which are the result of the educational history of the state.

In governance the problem is to find a proper balance in a three-fold relationship between institutional autonomy, coordination, and state controls. Neither autonomy nor coordination can, in the Panel's judgment, be the guiding principle. The challenge is to find the arrangement which gives not necessarily an equal amount of both but the proper combination of the two.

ALTERNATIVES AND CRITERIA

Eight alternative structures or arrangements for the governance of public higher education in California are examined in this report. The nature and scope of the study required that these alternatives be stated in broad terms and that the examination of them be kept reasonably uninvolved. The following alternatives are discussed in the balance of this report:

1. The present system, which consists of three independent public segments -- the University, the State Colleges, and the Junior Colleges -- coordinated by a statewide board or council with primarily advisory powers.

2. A system consisting of three independent public segments -- the University, the State Colleges, and the Junior Colleges -- coordinated by a statewide board or council with statutory authority in certain specified areas.

3. A system consisting of four independent segments -- the present three plus a new one made up of the smaller campuses of the University and the stronger State Colleges -- coordinated on a statewide basis as in Alternatives I or II.

4. A system consisting of a number of regionally organized

and interrelated units, each including one or more campuses from the University, the State Colleges, and the Junior Colleges. These regional units would be coordinated by a statewide council, or function without formal coordination on the state level.

5. A system composed of two independent public segments, one segment of all public institutions granting baccalaureate and graduate degrees -- i.e., the State Colleges and University campuses -- and one segment of institutions granting only associate degrees -- i.e., the Junior Colleges -- the two segments to be coordinated by a statewide board or council.

6. A system in which all public institutions of higher education -- University campuses, State Colleges, and Junior Colleges -- would be under the governance of a single board or council. Under this alternative no additional coordinating mechanism would be necessary.

7. A system consisting of three public segments -- the University, the State Colleges, the Junior Colleges -- coordinated by a board or council, with certain of the State Colleges transferred to the University.

8. A system consisting of public institutions -- University campuses, State Colleges, and Junior Colleges -- each governed locally by its own board and coordinated by a statewide board or council with specified regulatory powers.

The Panel felt it was important to have a set of criteria to assist in appraising the advantages and disadvantages of the various alternatives. The following criteria were formulated and discussed with the Ad Hoc Committee.

1. Achieve efficient and prudent use of public funds, including budgeting procedures and other financial arrangements which are consistent and fair to the institutions, and permit accurate evaluation of relative costs and benefits to the state of California.

2. Accomplish orderly growth of public higher education as the needs demand, including the development of new campuses or colleges, and provide for the allocation or elimination of educational programs among institutions.

3. Achieve, in the interest of improved higher education and economy, a maximum degree of cooperative educational and service activities among and between the various institutions and campuses -- public and private -- and with non-institutional groups as well.

4. Maintain and develop throughout the state a system of programs and services which encourage each person to achieve through education all of which he is capable, offering, on the one hand, a maximum number of open-door opportunities, and, on the other, appropriate programs which are selective with respect to a student's ability and previous achievement.

5. Permit individual institutions and campuses to develop unique programs and arrangements consistent with the needs and resources of the state, their area, and the actual or potential strength within the institution for such undertakings.

6. Achieve sufficient articulation among institutions of higher education and with secondary schools to assure orderly progress of students selected for admission and the encouragement of each student to go as far as his abilities will take him.

7. Maintain and improve the quality of public higher education at all levels, including the appraisal of the qualitative aspects of programs, services, and other activities in higher education in the state.

8. Function effectively as a system for decision making, management, communication, and action for the improvement of higher education.

9. Achieve recognition and acceptance by the legislature, government officials, political leaders, and others, including acceptance of the appropriate organization as the agency of the state responsible for the guidance and progress of higher education.

10. Adapt to changing political and organizational arrangements in the state which may affect higher education.

11. Increase public awareness and understanding of the needs and problems of higher education, and provide opportunities for the public to make known their hopes, aspirations, and unmet needs in this area.

12. Have access to and take into consideration the views of administrative officers, faculty, and students in the development of policies.

13. Achieve effective handling of Federal relationships, the dispersal of Federal funds, and the administration of Federal programs as may be required or is desirable at the state level.

14. Provide information, guidance, advice, and counsel to individual institutions and to other agencies of the state desiring to improve or change higher education and to serve as the statewide agency responsible for higher educational planning.

The preparation of the criteria was useful. It assured a common understanding between the Panel and the Ad Hoc Committee of the Council. As an instrument for measurement, evaluation, and selection, however, the list has limited value. Some of the criteria are so general as to apply without much distinction to all alternatives. Others contain more than one element, with differing judgments to be made on the several factors involved. The criteria have been kept to the fore, but served primarily to provide a framework within which the analysis has been made.

A further difficulty concerning the criteria was brought to the Panel's attention. Too great reliance upon the general standards which they set forth could result, it was felt, in a theoretical approach which might be unrelated to the immediate major problems facing higher education in California. This study, then, has been problem oriented, though conforming to the general principles stated in the criteria.

In formulating the major problems and challenges facing public higher education in California, the Panel depended almost completely upon the judgments of people in the state. These judgments were collected through confidential interviews and letters, and books and reports. The chief immediate problems facing higher education in California, problems which a sound organization of higher education should endeavor to resolve, appear to the Panel to be the following:

1. The problem of obtaining financial support sufficient to meet costs arising from continually expanding enrollment, increasing complexity of higher education, and rising cost levels for goods and services due to inflation.

2. The problem of public understanding of the principles and problems of higher education.

3. The problem of allocating managerial and developmental matters to established educational agencies, while reserving basic issues of public policy for informed legislative action.

4. The problem created by the fact that certain State Colleges could now provide programs and services beyond the role assigned them under the Master Plan.

5. The increasing dissatisfaction and growing protests over requirements of the Master Plan.

6. The questions concerning the amount of state support to be given the Junior Colleges and the extent of centralized direction of their work.

7. The need for greater coordination and a stronger movement of cooperation and mutual support between the institutions of higher education.

8. The need for educational leadership which can provide guidance in educational matters and can bring about prompt and, when necessary, coordinated action by the educational institutions.

Within the framework of the general criteria, the Panel has been concerned mainly with the advantages and the disadvantages of the alternatives from the standpoint of these issues. In this sense, the study was problem oriented, that is, concerned with finding a plan of governance which is sound and which also meets critical current problems in California in 1968 and for a number of years ahead.

ALTERNATIVE I - THE PRESENT SYSTEM

The present system, which consists of three independent public segments -- the University, the State Colleges, and the Junior Colleges -- coordinated by a statewide board or council with advisory powers.

This is the system currently in effect. Its two main features are (a) governance by the central office of each segment, each with its Board of Regents, Trustees, or Governors, and (b) coordination of these units by a central Coordinating Council through discussion, special studies, and voluntary acceptance by the segments of conclusions reached. The majority of the members of the Coordinating Council represent the educational units which must reject or accept the advice of the Council. The original plan called for no lay members, but six were added on the initiative of the Legislature, three in 1960 and three more in 1965. The addition of these lay members -- more particularly increasing the number to six -- has given a new tone to the discussions, but has not changed the character of the Council. The lay members are in the minority, sit in the presence of the professional educators, and are somewhat reduced in strength by the rules for alternates -- permitted for the educational representatives but not for the lay delegates. The Coordinating Council also has three members representing the private colleges and universities, an arrangement acceptable on the grounds that the Council advises but does not control the publicly supported institutions. A professional staff prepares papers, proposes topics for consideration, and makes recommendations to the Council for action.

The system operates under guidelines supplied by the Master Plan for Higher Education in California, adopted by the Legislature in 1960 through legislation known as the Donahoe Act.

This system places primary responsibility for governance upon the organized segmental units. The individual colleges and campuses -- junior colleges excepted at least for the present -- are subordinate to their respective central governing boards and administrative officers. The statewide co-ordinating agency is advisory only and does not infringe upon the authority of the State College and University systems.

Appraisal of the strengths of the present system must, in the Panel's judgment, distinguish initially between the advantages of initial adoption and those of continued operation. What advantages resulted from adopting the plan in 1960? Do these advantages continue to flow from its operation today?

There is no debate on the first question. The adoption of the Master Plan in 1960, at a time when there was a great upsurge in college and graduate school enrollment accompanied by the demands from many parts of the state for new institutions, was a great achievement and a gain for higher education. It brought order and stability, set outlines of development for the respective institutions, and attracted national and international interest. The Master Plan gave impetus to the concept of a state system of higher education and placed California in a position of educational leadership. At that time a council with essentially advisory powers was a forward step.

The second question -- concerning the advantages today -- is more difficult to answer. It is, however, the one with which this report must be primarily concerned. Since the present system places major emphasis on the administrative responsibility and freedom of the segmental organizations, the Panel begins with the question of the value and usefulness of this arrangement today. The question is the more relevant since certain of the alternatives to be considered later eliminate the segmental organization altogether. The organization of the 28 public four-year college and university centers of California into two large units, the University with nine units and the State Colleges with 19, and the assignment of their respective functions by law, has both advantages and disadvantages. The advantages are first, administrative, and secondly, coordinating. These, in the Panel's judgment, include the following:

1. Within the segments the administrative advantages are many. It is obvious that the newer University campuses have profited

greatly from their inclusion within the University of California. They have shared its prestige, profited from its influence and benefited greatly from its experience in administration. The use of its research libraries and other facilities has been very helpful. The State Colleges, though not built around a prestige institution, have also enjoyed nearly a decade of marked growth which they probably would have not experienced to the same degree had they remained separate institutions under the direction of the State Board of Education. Their central administration has provided a unified approach to the State Government, and successfully promoted their need for financial support. The State Colleges have profited from the avoidance of competition with each other, their respective faculties have gained by their association with each other, and the central administrative office has provided the colleges with strong representation outside of government and with many special services. These matters are too often taken for granted.

2. The segmental structure, together with certain specific provisions of the Master Plan, provides California with a clearly defined, though sometimes misinterpreted, legally based

differentiation of program and function for its institutions of higher education. This report will have much to say about some unhappy results of the present system in this respect, but its positive value must not be overlooked. Alan Cartter has referred to what he calls "the university syndrome," the innate desire of junior colleges to become four-year colleges, and of four-year colleges to become universities. California cannot afford and does not need 27 Berkeleys, nor 110 four-year undergraduate colleges. Limitation of program and function is inescapable; nor can allocation of funds be made except within the guidelines for allocation of functions and programs. Those who believe that the present method is not ideal may be right, but its merits and demerits can only be discussed in terms of some other plan of accomplishing the same ends. The present segmental organization has imposed a broad coordinated pattern upon California's more than one hundred public institutions with resulting order and economy. The statutory segmental structure thus functions as a means of governmental decentralization and assignment of responsibility, as a coordinating mechanism for two large groups of institutions of higher education, and as a center for providing many administrative and academic services to the respective college and university campuses within each segment.

3. The present system provides coordination also through the advice of the Coordinating Council. The Council has, in spite of its critics, a record of accomplishment. It has guided the implementation of the Master Plan, approving new programs from the standpoint of their appropriateness for the respective segments. It has contributed successfully to the problem of orderly growth, advising the Legislature concerning the establishment of new campuses. It has provided a forum for discussion and resolution of some common problems, as, for example, the calendar to be adopted for year-round operation. It has advised the Legislature and the Governor on a series of questions. It has investigated numerous problems of higher education and published the results. It has administered certain Federal programs. Its advice has not always been taken, but, on the whole, the Council appears to have functioned as was intended, with two exceptions:

    - It has probably not attained the influence which the founding fathers in 1960 hoped for it.

    - It has not been, by its own admission, very successful in its recommendations on budgetary matters.

4. The present medium for effecting coordination, namely, the Coordinating Council with a majority of its members experienced educators, can claim some advantages. Actions have been taken in the light of full expert discussion of the issues. Perhaps as a result of this, the Panel found virtually no charge even in retrospect of serious errors contained in actions taken by the Council -- one or two controversial issues excepted. There are, however, criticisms of the Council's failure to act on certain issues or to take up certain problems.

5. The advisory character of the Council has made it acceptable to the segments which compose it. While its sessions have frequently produced heated debate, there has not been in California the bitterness which has occurred in some states in the establishment or operation of a statewide board. While the Master Plan has not been carried out in every respect, the constituent institutions have cooperated with the Council and its staff. The Council has not been the subject of any public controversy.

The present system also has, in the Panel's judgment, the limitations and disadvantages which at least in part develop from the strength and independence of the educational segments. With respect to these, the Panel observes that:

1. The present plan has the disadvantage of its merits by emphasizing the autonomy of the segmental organizations, thereby limiting what can be done in coordination. How much coordination in a system of higher education is needed is, of course, a question which cannot be answered in the abstract, but there was general agreement among most of those consulted that the Coordinating Council needs to be "stronger," especially if the present segmental structure is to be continued. There are many problems in higher education in California on which the Council at present is either unable to act, or unwilling to act. Illustrations are its inability to deal with the problem of State Colleges which could now provide programs and services beyond the role assigned them in the Master Plan, questions affecting the division of funds between the segments or the amounts to be supplied to special educational purposes such as medical education, the tuition issue which divided the state, the proper number of general university campuses, a concerted statewide program for higher education for underprivileged students, constructive programs of cooperation on the local level, or the elimination of program duplication. In this connection a distinguished educator thoroughly familiar with the work of the Council commented to us, "At present the segmental interests are so strongly represented in

the Council that it becomes difficult to make recommendations in the interest of all higher education in California." Success of the present system in effecting coordination has been limited. In terms of today's needs its accomplishments may be inadequate. Issues not able to be settled by procedures of the present educational system will be settled by the political one. Some questions can only be settled there, but higher education pays a price -- and the Legislature itself pays a price -- if too many of the specific problems of public higher education have to be referred to the Legislature.

2. The dissatisfaction of the State Colleges, with the seeming limitations of their role in the present system and the developing competition between the State Colleges and the University, are problems of serious import. Specific issues include respective work loads of professors in the two segments, the levels of compensation, fringe benefits, right to offer doctoral programs, the respective budgetary appropriations, and others including even the change of name of the State Colleges. These are mentioned to indicate the spreading character of the problem. Resting much of its case for a restructuring of higher education on what it calls the "rivalry and competition" between the seg-

ments, the Joint Committee for Higher Education of the Legislature notes that, "Clearly some of this competition is beneficial ... but in our judgment it has now reached the point at which it threatens not only to cost the tax payers excessively but also to deprive many students of reasonably equal educational opportunities." Dr. Arthur Coons, in his recent volume, speaks of tensions in higher education in the state with the comment that, "The main struggles have been between and among segments themselves . . . vying for advantage, favor and finance. At times these segments have sought or have found common ground. At other times, and more characteristically, they have been vying vigorously for their own interests, often with not much evidence to support the idea of a commonly respected profession, manifesting bitter animosity, charges, and counterclaims." The dangers in this situation are obvious. The Coordinating Council appears to have only tangential relationship to this problem or set of problems. The question of the name change for State Colleges only came before the Council through action of the staff, and after the measure had been actually passed by one house of the Legislature. Privately the right of the Council even to consider the measure has been questioned. The existence of these tensions between segments is not new, but that it is increasing and that there appears to be no means by which it can be resolved other than through a political struggle represents a serious weakness in the present plan of governance.

3. The present organization on the state level seems to be handicapped in achieving communication, cooperation, and mutual assistance across segmental lines. While numerous cases of cooperation and assistance can be cited, separate administrative lines of authority must be bridged and agreements negotiated for these to have official status. The joint doctoral programs officially approved are four, though several more are under discussion. The Joint Committee for Higher Education was able to say that the progress of recent years "has done little to alter the fact that California has four separate but parallel systems which are only very loosely connected in a common purpose." The present structure seemingly does not encourage such things as faculty interchange, joint appointments, and extensive common use of expensive equipment.

4. The present plan of governance has not provided a strong voice representative of higher education as a whole. The officers of several segments, able and respected as they are, cannot speak

> for higher education as a whole. The Coordinating Council either cannot or does not. Its scope is limited; its voice lacks authority. While higher education will always be pluralistic in philosophy and in many respects in practice, it would seem a disadvantage that at no point is there provided a center of leadership and representation for higher education. The theory when the Master Plan was adopted was that this would be accomplished by the growing influence of the Coordinating Council. There is some question whether the position and prestige of the Council have become sufficiently strong for the purpose.

Discussion of this alternative necessarily poses the question whether this system should be continued, and under what conditions. It has the advantage of being in operation, and under it the institutions of higher education have made great progress. As one well informed citizen put it, "possibly the state should settle down and do a better job with the system we have." In some respects the system is being improved:

1. The Coordinating Council has authorized what it calls an "annual educational audit," a report annually from the segments on the number of credit hours earned in each subject in each institution. This will bring to light, it is believed,

programs which are not justified by the results achieved. Advice can then be given concerning the more expensive ones.

2. Cooperation between the segments seems to be increasing slowly. The number of doctorates provided through cooperative programs between the University and a State College is being increased. In the San Francisco area a consortium of institutions is studying a cooperative attack upon the problems of an urban area, though it must be added that the project is sponsored by a private foundation. Some other activities could be cited. All such cooperative developments will give more versatility to the system as a whole.

Some changes might be made in the details of operation which might reduce the disadvantages while preserving the advantages:

1. A proposal repeatedly heard is that the Coordinating Council should be changed to a lay board, or at least to one where lay members representing the general public are in the majority. This, it is argued, would remove the suspicion that the Council is a protective association of interested parties -- comparable, that is, to a governmental regulatory body composed of representatives of the interests to be regulated. There is general -- though not complete -- agreement that this would at least improve

the image of the Council. It could quite possibly strengthen its influence. It would enable the Council to function more as an adjudicating body and less as a market place for hard bargains. Since the issues before the Council are predominantly those of relationships between the segments and matters of general state educational policy, and not technical educational questions, there is much to be said for changes in this direction.

2. A second suggestion also related to the matter of lay participation recommends that public representatives be allowed alternates, as is the case with the segmental representatives. This has less in its favor. Its effect would probably be minor. Furthermore, alternate members, functioning only occasionally and in their own capacities, would have only a second hand knowledge of what had preceded and a weak grasp of the issues and procedures.

3. Whether the Council be changed to consist of all lay members or of a majority of lay members, one further change is repeatedly suggested -- the term of office of public members of the Council (presently four years) should be lengthened, if this can be done. Arguments for lengthening the term are two:

    - A representative of the public becomes more and useful as he becomes familiar with the problems, the procedures, and the traditional thinking of the educational institutions.

- With longer terms the Council is insulated to a greater degree from too sudden a change in the political climate.

4. Repeatedly the suggestion has been made that the Coordinating Council should be given more power. It should have, it has been said, authority in certain areas, or what power it has should be spelled out more carefully and made statutory. This, however, would be change of such significance that the Panel has dealt with it as a separate alternative. The principle in question is the creation of a body which would have authority to over-ride in some respects the respective governing boards of the segments. This is the "super-board" alternative, which is considered next as Alternative II.

Most educators and knowledgeable citizens, when asked during this study whether the present system, perhaps with change, should be continued, have replied, "It depends upon the alternatives." We proceed, then, to consider the implications, advantages and disadvantages of other alternatives.

ALTERNATIVE II - A COUNCIL OR BOARD WITH AUTHORITY IN SPECIFIED AREAS

A system consisting of three independent public segments -- the University, the State Colleges, and the Junior Colleges -- coordinated by a statewide board or council with statutory authority in certain specified areas.

The Panel has for the purposes of discussion assumed that the council or board under this alternative would consist of citizens representative of the public interest, recognized as men of ability and experience, interested in the progress, both in quality and quantity, of the institutions of higher education of the state. They would not be representative of any segment or institution. It seems reasonable to the Panel that a board or council with fairly broad authority over matters affecting public higher education should be independent of the institutions affected by its decisions. Such a board or council might have fewer members than the present Council in which, of course, various interests are represented. The expert knowledge of experienced educators, including representation from segments, could be made available by several means, including non-voting memberships. The Panel has further assumed that a professional staff would be supplied. Advisory committees could be set up representing faculty groups, students, etc. Actually the details need not be debated -- the concept is a body of all or at least a majority of lay members, assisted by a professional staff, holding much increased authority over and responsibility for the development of higher education in California.

The proposal envisages a federal system in which a board or council would have certain statewide powers with all other powers not so delegated remaining in the hands of the presently existing governing boards of the segments. The areas in which the Coordinating Council -- for the present name would serve adequately and could be continued -- would have authority could be presumed to be those presently assigned (Sec. 22501 of the Donahoe Act of 1960 as amended), plus those given to the Council currently on an essentially advisory basis. Areas where Council authority would be strengthened include:

1. Reviewing, coordinating, and recommending to the Governor and the Legislature the operating budgets and capital expenditures of the several segments.

2. Implementing the Master Plan with respect to the functions and programs of the several segments of public education.

3. Approving plans for orderly growth, including the need for and location of new facilities and programs.

The crucial item in this list of duties is the assignment of a coordinating role in the budgetary process. This might be accomplished by a statute or an inactment by the Legislature, comparable to the one presently in force concerning the establishment of new campuses and new institutions, stating that budgetary requests for higher education would be considered only after approved by the council or board. By this means, it has been suggested, the constitutional issue vis-a-vis the University of California might be avoided.

In the Panel's judgment, the principal argument for this alternative is that it helps correct two criticisms of the present structure -- the basis of membership of the present Coordinating Council, and the present Council's seeming inability to deal effectively with many of the major problems of higher education. The plan proposes a statewide body with greater responsibilities for coordination, with defined and real authority, with the center of interest and control shifted from concerns about segmental relationships to concerns about state interests and needs, and presumably with greater freedom of action. The change would be a major move toward greater coordination of the publicly supported institutions. The specific arguments in favor of this alternative would, in the Panel's judgment, be the following:

1. Coordination of higher education would move from the statutory-voluntary stage, which in one state after another

has proven inadequate, to a legislatively authorized process of coordination.

2. Membership change would enable all members to act on their own judgment and responsibility, giving greater objectivity and expediting action. Block voting -- a familiar practice -- presumably would no longer have a place. Decisions would be free from the suspicion, and even the charge, of being protective of special interests.

3. Budgetary review and coordination before transmission to the Governor and Legislature would strengthen the process of coordination both directly and indirectly. It would bring before the council or board issues of the relative growth of different parts of the system of higher education with respect to function and program which are currently discussed and decided by administrative or Master Plan fiat or by political authorities. The total financial picture would be a principal concern of a body, representative of the public, but responsible for meeting the state's total needs for public higher education.

4. A special circumstance would seem to make such a possibility a timely one. The Junior Colleges are pressing for a larger

percentage of state aid. The increase of state funds for the Junior Colleges is not without relationship to the budgets of other segments. It would seem desirable to have all of the factors in the problem considered by some body with knowledge and holding statewide responsibility for higher education.

5. The Coordinating Council to date has concerned itself primarily with new programs from the standpoint of their appropriateness to a segment under the functions assigned by the Master Plan. It is, however, moving tentatively toward a concern over unnecessary duplication of programs apart from the question of the purity of the segmental function. The Terman Report on Engineering Education illustrates the kind of problem which must be dealt with. Unnecessary duplication of a specialized educational program can occur within a segment, and there can be needless duplication in a particular locality by two segments in programs approved per se for each. It is hoped that the annual "educational audit", which the Council is initiating, will bring such situations to attention. But definition and identification of educational programs is difficult at best. Knowledge of the supporting budgetary data would be of major assistance in this delicate area.

6. Budgetary review and responsibility by the Council might provide an approach to some problems with which the faculties of the State colleges are concerned. Dr. Coons in his recent book has pointed out that there is nothing in the Master Plan against more M. A. students in State colleges, nor against increases in library support, faculty remuneration, professional travel, leaves of absence, and other warmly debated issues, including appropriate research. The debate on these issues turns in part on available financial resources, but also in part on the extent to which they are appropriate to the function of the State Colleges under the Master Plan. It would seem desirable for the agency set up to interpret and implement the Master Plan, to consider and advise on this second part of the question. Thus far it has not done so, either because the Council did not feel free to become involved in budgetary or administrative matters or for other reasons. The proposed budgetary responsibility - removing at least some feeling of ultra vires in these matters - together with the change in the constitution of the membership, might open the door for clarification of this problem of the function or functions of the State Colleges under the Master Plan.

The circumstances and attitudes in which higher education finds itself are changing, not only in California but throughout the nation. The responses called for may be in new forms or even in new types of institutions. For example, it is widely recognized that changes are taking place in the traditional four-year undergraduate program, changes that will affect all institutions of higher education, including the junior colleges. Should the traditional baccalaureate degree course become a three-year program, radical readjustments may be in store for all of higher education. Adjustments of this kind cannot be done by one segment of the system alone without disruption and maladjustment. The strength of a system of public education will be found to a large extent in its ability to adjust to new circumstances, whatever they may be. Coordination becomes increasingly important, and a stronger council or board, resting on greater legislative authority would seem to have many advantages to offer.

Such a system -- a council or board with authority and regulatory powers -- is not without its limitations. These include the following:

1. Certain key areas of responsibility are taken from established, experienced, governing organizations, and placed in or shared with a council or board of laymen without specialized knowledge, burdened with pressing occupations and duties of their own. While a board or council would certainly have a

professional staff to advise it, the point can hardly be denied that a major university has built-in advantages in the recruiting and building of able staff. Universities can offer tenure appointments; they have established positions in the academic world; they have a permanence and they engender loyalities which a governmental agency can never achieve. Thus, the staff work of a coordinating board or council may not always be as effective as that of the administrative offices of the institutions for which it is responsible.

2. No matter how competent the staff, a council or board would receive its advice through one person, the Director. As a counterbalance, and as an assurance that the discussions of the board or council would always be fully informed, it would be possible to have one representative -- presumably the President or Chancellor -- of each segment with membership on the council or board without a vote. Membership is important -- they would receive all communications and attend all meetings. The vote is less important -- three votes out of fifteen would not change the character of the council or board. Since, however, the three votes could rarely determine an outcome -- and perhaps should not, under this conception of the council or

board -- the no-vote alternative would create a clearer image of the council and might relieve the segmental representatives of some embarrassments.

3. It has been argued that the creation of such a strong board or council would make it more difficult to secure the ablest men for the Boards of Governors, Trustees and Regents. Men of outstanding ability, it is sometimes said, are not disposed to accept assignments where decisions reached could be overruled by another body. In some cases this may be right. One is compelled to point out, however, that a "super-board," so far as the Boards of Governors, Trustees, and Regents are concerned, presently exists in the form of legislative committees to which the budgetary and other requests of the institutions must go. What the proposed change does is to give a board or council the duty of sharing in certain responsibilities currently discharged only by non-educationally related state officers and elected officials not connected with educational concerns.

4. It could be argued that a strengthened budgetary role for a council or board is not necessary, since the job of budget review is being handled adequately in state offices; it would

introduce an additional step in the budgetary process which is already protracted and energy consuming. Furthermore, an enlarged staff would be necessary for the council or board to discharge this duty properly. The Panel is not disposed to question these statements for the following reasons:

a. Our staff found confidence on the part of the educational community in the competence and integrity of the Department of Finance and the Office of the Legislative Analyst.

b. The steps we propose need not remove from these offices the responsibilities they now carry, though some adjustments might be made.

c. Undoubtedly a council or board would have to have a sizeable staff in the financial area, which would probably be a good thing.

The more important question to answer is -- will the gains to higher education in California be worth the effort? At this stage this question can be dealt with, in the Panel's judgment, only in general terms:

a. The council presumably would direct its attention on budget matters more especially to problems of over-all balance, the budgetary aspects of new programs or campuses, the costs of duplication in some fields, to fiscal issues involved in implementing or modifying the Master Plan, and related questions.

b. Present budgeting difficulties are all too likely to become greater as costs continue to mount. New campuses may possibly be established, and Junior Colleges are asking for a larger percentage of state funds. To put these various requests together and to appraise the effects on the state's educational system of the division of funds proposed before these requests reach the capitol, would appear to be an important and useful step in the total budgeting process.

c. The State Colleges, which have contended with limited success for less detailed requirements in their budgetary presentation, might find an intermediary to be of assistance.

d. The gains to the Junior Colleges would be presumably in having an additional voice to support their legitimate needs.

5. A council or board with authority rules out participation of the private sector. At present, no serious issues have been raised by the presence of the three representatives of the private

colleges and universities in the Council, since the Council is advisory only. There is strong feeling, however, that participation in the stronger governance of the public institutions by private colleges, themselves free from the authority of a council or board, would be unacceptable.

Under the proposal made above, this objection disappears, since no segment under this plan would have a vote in the reorganized council or board. A single representative of the private colleges could thus take a non-voting place in the council or board without exercising authority, if the public segments were also represented.

6. The final objection to Alternative II is that in spite of all of its strengthening of the Council, it does not resolve some of the major issues facing higher education in California. Two such problems can be named. It would not necessarily end the dissatisfaction of the State Colleges. While some of the particular problems might be handled by a council with expanded responsibility and different personnel, it would be naive to assume that the major thrust of the State College system for equality of status and other changes would fade away. A second major problem which a board or council under this alternative

> would not be able readily to resolve is that of particular State Colleges which may be capable of programs and functions beyond those defined in the Master Plan. Granting this "university syndrome," as it has been called, and granting that it must be resisted for sound financial and other reasons, the fact remains that an arbitrary decision made in 1960 of what kinds of education should be provided in a particular institution can become outmoded and ill-advised by changes and developments which could not have been foreseen. This, in the Panel's opinion, is one of the most serious and difficult problems. Failure to resolve it underlies and supports much of the present unrest.

In summary, the Panel concludes that an increase in the authority of the Coordinating Council and a change in its basis of membership has a number of advantages. On balance, there appears to be value in having the statewide board or council involved formally in the budgetary process. In the long run, if the present organization of higher education into three major segments in maintained, concern with the allocation of state funds to the respective segments would seem unavoidable, if a board or council is to discharge its responsibility for "orderly growth." The change probably could be effected by legislative action without involving constitutional revision, although this would be a matter on which legal opinion would have to speak.

Some of the advantages of this alternative might be secured by changes in the membership and terms of office of the present Coordinating Council. The question which must be answered is whether these results would be sufficient to meet the growing problem of an increasingly large and competitive higher education system. In other words, would one not find oneself in a halfway house, without the clear advantages of the present plan, nor of a stronger one?

If adopted, the new authority and character suggested for the board or council should be established by legislative act, with constitutional status for the board or council perhaps to be considered after experience.

ALTERNATIVE III -- A FOURTH PUBLIC SEGMENT

A system consisting of four independent public segments -- the present three plus a new one made up of the smaller campuses of the University and the stronger State Colleges -- coordinated on a statewide basis as in Alternatives I or II.

This alternative is in fact a variant of the two which have been previously discussed. It not only accepts but expands the segmental organization of higher education. It provides for coordination through a council or board with either advisory or regulatory powers, depending upon which of the previous plans is used as its base. It shares most of the advantages and disadvantages of the previous two proposals which, therefore, need not be repeated here. Its uniqueness is in the fourth segment, created by combining certain units of the State Colleges and of the University. Associated with certain designated State Colleges, it is suggested, would be the smaller University campuses where some doctoral work has been initiated, but where further progress will be slow, with undergraduate teaching likely to remain the more important function for the foreseeable future.

The case for this alternative, which would place certain of the strong State Colleges and the smaller University campuses into a segment of their own, rests mainly on the following three arguments:

1. The present segments, it is argued, are too large, too centralized, and too powerful. They cannot be fitted effectively into any integrated system of public higher education. One can achieve compromises between them but not actual coordination. A fourth segment would reduce the size and power of each of the other segments which grant baccalaureate and graduate degrees, and produce a better balanced state system of higher education, at least for purposes of coordination and governance.

2. A second argument has to do with improving the relative status of certain institutions or campuses over that which they enjoy within their present segmental assignments. Smaller University campuses may feel they do not receive a sufficient share of the interest and thought of Regents and University officials. From at least some of the State Colleges one hears the plea for greater decentralization than presently obtains. As members of a fourth segment certain University campuses and the stronger State Colleges could possibly achieve greater individuality and mover forward

more rapidly than if they remained as parts of their present segments.

3. Something must be done to break through the seeming rigidity of the Master Plan on the future role and destiny of each institution of higher education in California. Greater flexibility must be achieved. The decisions made in 1960 as to function must be reviewed in the light of eight years of rapid change, and the functions of each institution should be judged on its leadership, its resources, and its promise, not prejudged without reference to these facts. The formation of a fourth segment could help accomplish these desirable ends.

These arguments are, in the Panel's judgment, strengthened by two additional considerations:

- Not all State Colleges, it is recognized, should have the door to doctoral work and university status opened to them.
- Those institutions capable of enlarged program responsibility if given the opportunity, should not aspire to become rivals of the Berkeley campus.*

---

*During the study the staff was repeatedly confronted with the following argument: California at present expects its institutions of senior rank to be either primarily undergraduate colleges or full-fledged universities, there is no place for the type of institution found in virtually every other state of the Union, namely the university with recognized graduate strength in certain areas but not in all, and with no commitment, promise, or expectation to provide equivalent strength in all departments. The new segment, it is argued, would provide a place for such institutions.

The arguments against such an arrangement relate to effective transfer of institutions, resulting relative status of institutions, and the difficulty of assigning role and scope. In the Panel's judgment, such factors as the following are germane:

1. The Trustees of the State Colleges could be asked by the board or council to consult with the officers of each college and to declare for each institution what educational functions are believed to be feasible and desirable in the foreseeable future -- whether, in other words, the long-range plans for each include or should include the doctoral degree for any department and if so, for which departments. On the basis of these replies the council or board might recommend to the Legislature that laws be enacted assigning the list selected to the new segment. The difficulties involved in any such process of selection, however, are obvious.

2. The transfer of University campuses to the new segment would be especially difficult. Judgments made as to the campuses which seem to have less promise and should not become general University campuses would not be easy. Decisions could be reached only by a balancing of divergent factors. Since these campuses would appear to be downgraded, the transfers would be bitterly resisted.

3. Even if the fourth segment could be assembled it would still be on a lower level than the University of California, with the probability of continuation of the unhappiness now in the State Colleges which would be elevated, and the certainty of unhappiness in the University campuses which were reduced in status. The State Colleges left behind would probably be unhappy also. The officers who made the distinctions would probably find it desirable to transfer to the newly created segment.

4. The new segment, being a "half-way house," would raise innumerable administrative and financial questions. How much doctoral work should be developed? Would the teaching load be the same as that of the University? Under what conditions would the applications of additional colleges be considered? Could not the better institutions in the segment move over to become part of the University of California?

5. Instead of facilitating interchange and cooperative experiments between the institutions of higher education, this proposal further divides administratively the state's system of higher education, setting up yet another segmental competitor for state funds, and yet another variable to contend with in trying to effect higher education cooperation and coordination.

The primary argument for this proposal is that the present allocation of functions of the Master Plan on an either-or basis is too rigid to be workable. The development of a new segment, it is hoped by some, would provide a middle course, eliminating the present dissatisfaction and at the same time using the opportunity to review functions and to make new assignments in the light of developments since 1960. There is ground for real doubt, in the Panel's judgment, as to whether the proposal would accomplish any except possibly the last of these three objectives -- re-examination of functions. There is also question whether the middle course or role can be clearly defined, and especially whether the new role would be satisfactory to any of the parties concerned -- the State Colleges, which would have lost their stronger members, to the University which would feel itself dismembered, or to the new segment which would still feel itself in a second-class position. The obvious difficulties of creating the segment, the wounds which would be left after the event, and the likely perpetuation of the present rigidity of segments makes this alternative, in the Panel's judgment, of doubtful value to the future of higher education in California.

ALTERNATIVE IV - A REGIONAL ORGANIZATION

A system consisting of a number of regionally organized and interrelated units, each including one or more campuses from the University, the State Colleges, and the Junior Colleges. These regional units would be coordinated by a statewide council, or function without formal coordination on the state level.

This alternative has its genesis in criticism that the present system has not achieved appropriate cooperative activity among the segments. Its further supporting argument is that the structuring of higher education by segments has outlived its usefulness and needs to be radically modified.

The concept of a regionally oriented college and university system can be stated with variations of detail. Two versions appear in the descriptive statement at the head of this section -- one functions under a statewise coordinating agency, presumably with some regulatory powers, the other with no central coordinating agency but possibly with local councils or boards working out joint programs, faculty interchange, etc. Yet another variation would continue the segmental form of organization on some advisory basis with governing authority vested in the regional structures.

The strongest arguments for a regional organization of higher education in the state are found in the Progress Report of the Joint Committee on Higher

Education of the Legislature. This alternative is advanced as "one possible course of action in response to what the Committee finds to be a serious obstacle to the continued development of higher education in this state." The purpose of the Joint Committee in presenting the proposal is to "open this whole area to further analysis and discussion."

The arguments for this arrangement are found in the Report of the Joint Committee. The Committee argues that two weaknesses of the segmental arrangement must be corrected. These two weaknesses are the competition and rivalry between the segments which has resulted, and the failure to develop a cooperative and integrated system of higher education. With respect to these factors, the Joint Committee arguments are that:

1. "One of the major objectives of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education was to draw together the three separate elements of public higher education into a 'tripartite' system with coordinated operations and objectives. In our opinion, the Master Plan was at best only temporarily successful in this regard . . . Following a brief truce the four systems are once more entering into intense competition for the basic resources of higher education. As a result of this competition, walls have been erected which are rarely surmounted . . . The rivalry among the four systems centers

upon the competition for funds. The continuing struggle between the University and the State Colleges is obvious and well known, but there is also a growing competition between the Junior Colleges and the other two systems for both current and capital funds . . . Added to this is a growing source of competition between the public and private institutions for public subsidies as well as for private gifts and grants."

2. Competition for top-rated students, for faculty, for research funds, federal grants and projects "and many of the other elements (except perhaps student unrest) which mark leading colleges and universities are not good things."

3. Failure to develop an integrated and cooperative system of public higher education follows inevitably from the above. Much more could be done in common use of expensive facilities, in shared use of instructional talent, in joint participation in projects and programs, in instruction of students across institutional and segmental lines, and in other respects.

4. As an alternative to the present three segmental arrangement, a consolidation of the Junior Colleges, State Colleges, and University campuses into a regionally oriented system should

be accomplished. As described by the Committee, "The university centers would provide a focus for doctoral and post-doctoral training, organized research, and a very limited amount of undergraduate instruction. In many cases the existing campuses of the University would serve as the new university centers, but several of the larger State campuses such as San Francisco, San Jose, and San Diego State Colleges might also be converted to this function." Related to each university center would be the four-year liberal arts college -- with some specialization permitted but with emphasis on upper division instruction. Some of the smaller present university campuses which have strong undergraduate programs might retain this emphasis within the system.

5. Within each regional system it is assumed that because of their closeness and regional organization freer relationships and a flow of appropriate inter-institutional activities would develop. Faculty members might teach in more than one institution. Specialized facilities, such as research laboratories and libraries, computer centers, and television equipment would serve the regional academic community.

The Panel agrees that this proposal by the Joint Committee is an original and provocative approach to the problem of the organization of higher education. The proposal addresses itself to a number of the central issues including the competition between segments and the resulting difficulties in effecting a smoothly integrated state system of higher education, and the possibility of increased levels of educational responsibility for certain institutions which now feel limited in their role and scope. Specific advantages which, in the Panel's judgment, this proposed form of organization would provide include:

1. The dissatisfaction of the State Colleges with respect to their present status might be ended or greatly reduced. New alignments would be created and the possibility of new functions and program responsibilities opened. While teachers of undergraduates would remain teachers of undergraduates, they would presumably have the status and satisfaction of belonging to a regional university with its involvement in higher education at all levels.

2. There would be a definite possibility of assigning new programs and functions to campuses which might be broader than those connected with present segmental assignments.

3. Through the provision of a single administrative structure for the institutions within the region, many impediments to cooperative activities would be removed and stimulus given to exchange activities, mutual services, and better articulation at all levels.

4. The wide gap between present statewide segment administrations and the local institutions would be greatly reduced since "central" administration much closer to home would be provided. It is sometimes difficult for the statewide governing board or their officers to understand or appreciate local problems or local initiative.

These arguments, in the Panel's judgment, make a strong case which must be considered carefully. The major values of the plan are those of closer relationships to the region served and, secondly, the building of new relationships of a cooperative character between institutions within a geographical area.

With respect to the negative considerations of this alternative, the Panel notes that:

1. While competition between the segments is eliminated, a new kind of competition may replace it. This competition is

geographical or regional in character. If all statewide administrative and coordinating agencies are eliminated, the competitive pressures of needs and interests and local pride could only be settled by the Legislature in Sacramento. To organize higher education on the same pattern as the political structure of the state could make the regions' political representatives the champions of regional educational needs and requests. Two undesirable results could follow:

a. There could be a return to direct legislative handling of many educational problems, and the resolution of these issues, in part at least, in terms of the position and influence of the region's representatives; and

b. There is the possibility that the region's political leadership could hold a virtual veto on educational proposals. Without their support and active assistance, little could be hoped for. To be sure, political factors are involved in decisions currently being made, but with a difference. The proposals and requests have a statewide -- though segmental -- character.

On balance, it would appear that competition between educational segments, as undesirable as it is, is subject to better control by state officials and legislative action, and carries less danger to intelligent handling of the issues, than competition between regions which could easily become competition between the political representatives of them.

2. The gain in terms of closer relationships between institutions in geographical proximity to each other are real ones, but this too is accompanied by losses. Academic relationships, particularly in upper division and graduate work, are not all with local institutions. A department or school of fine arts, for example. may have more associations with a college or university in another part of the state than with those in its own region. Regionalism, pushed too hard, can result in provincialism of outlook and of leadership.

3. Regionalism, without some central coordinating body to review programs and new undertakings, can also result in unnecessary duplication and waste of resources. Special economic interests in a locality and local pride can exert pressures for new programs within a region where existing programs elsewhere would serve

the actual needs of the state. Duplication by segments -- the concern of the Master Plan -- would be replaced by the problem of duplication by regional systems.

These considerations suggest to the Panel that a regional structuring of California's system of higher education, especially without any agency intervening between the regional units and the Legislature to review and coordinate program developments and budget requests, would be a backward step.

Could the dangers be eliminated and the values maintained by accepting the proposal in an alternative form, namely, a regional structure coordinated by a statewide board or council? Such a council or board no doubt would be similar to that discussed above under Alternative II -- a council or board with regulatory powers. It would coordinate regional units rather than educational segments. Would this version offer advantages or disadvantages over the one discussed? Could a board or council function more effectively or less effectively with this important change in structure?

Since the system of regional approaches to educational needs has not been tried, any answer to this question is to a considerable degree conjectural. Many of the issues are complex, with numerous and often conflicting factors involved. Answers in such cases are usually debatable. There are, however, in the Panel's judgment, a number of crucial issues:

1. Will a central council or board be strong enough to override, as might often be necessary, the claims of the stronger geographical regions of the state? Would decisions of a statewide council or board be acceptable to the most powerful regions, and could the board or council control the situation? Most of those interviewed believed that the answer to these questions would have to be no. The Legislature would have to have considerable confidence in the council or board and give it firm support or the structure would collapse.

2. In some respects the work of a board or council would be easier. Problems of unnecessary duplication in programs and services within a region could be made the responsibility of the regional governing board.

3. With respect to decisions between the regions, the question arises whether the council or board would have objective and self-evident grounds on which to rest its actions. At present, there is at least the Master Plan which supplies legally constituted guidelines.

4. Some of the problems of competing geographical units might be handled on the basis of formulae, but not all of them. The critical case would be that of the conflicting ambitions and plans of the university centers in each region. Universities are prolific in beginning new ventures and projects, and desirably so. Would all universities be brought forward at the same pace? Would quantitative considerations -- the relative population figures, taxes paid, etc. -- provide adequate standards for all judgments?

5. Not unrelated is the question which asks whether a new Master Plan or framework can be devised and agreed upon based on a geographical division of the state, or in its absence, whether the decisions of a council or board would appear arbitrary, unacceptable, and subject to appeal to the local political authority.

In the Panel's judgment, the regional proposal is strongest in its strong encouragement of local integration and cooperation. It is weakest in its unleashing of regional competition and the ease with which this might take political form. Education should unite the state, not divide it. If, however, this alternative is not adopted as a structure for governance, there will continue to be a need for a new approach to inter-institutional relationships within the several regions. Any plan which is adopted should, in the Panel's judgment, attempt at least to deal with this issue rapidly and forthrightly.

ALTERNATIVE V - TWO SEGMENTS: THE CONSOLIDATED UNIVERSITY AND THE JUNIOR COLLEGES

A system composed of two independent public segments, one segment of all public institutions granting baccalaureate and graduate degrees -- i.e., the State Colleges and University campuses -- and one segment of institutions granting only associate degrees -- i.e., the Junior Colleges -- the two segments to be coordinated by a statewide board or council.

In this alternative the segments are reduced to two. One segment would have all the institutions giving the baccalaureate and advanced degrees, and the other all the Junior Colleges. Presumably the unhappy competitive element in the present structure -- between segments -- would be eliminated.

For purposes of the discussion of this alternative certain assumptions have been made by the Panel.

- Although the present State Colleges and University campuses would be under one administration and control, there would be no implication of identical programs for all 28 institutions. All would be members of the one organization and therefore equally eligible for assignment of undergraduate, advanced, and/or specialized programs.

- The name of the combined institution need not be a major problem. The University of California enjoys constitutional status, and this carries obvious advantages. For this reason it is assumed that this alternative would be accomplished by adding the present State Colleges to the University of California.

- It is also assumed that appropriate changes in the governing board would be effected in connection with the transfer in order to assure proper knowledge of and concern for the interests of all institutions in the system.

Furthermore, the Panel makes a number of additional assumptions on this point. The first matter is that of the relationship of the consolidated university to a board or council. The Panel believes that while its duties will be different from those of say the present Council, there will continue to be a need for a statewide board or council. Its functions would include:

- To engage in studies dealing with the effectiveness, cost, and need for present or additional services, without being on the defensive or suspected of being defensive.

- To make judgments on new campuses which would seem to be more effectively dealt with by an informed but independent body.

- To coordinate the Junior Colleges and the four-year institutions and advise on levels of support.

- To administer certain Federal programs.

- To coordinate public and privately supported institutions. If at a later date public support were provided to private colleges, an even enlarged role would be required of the council or board. In a word, there would arise a need for an independent body and for a countervailing force to the consolidated University and the Junior College system. There would seem to be no need, however, in the circumstances proposed, for such a council or board to have regulatory powers. It could continue to be advisory to the two segments and to the Legislature as the Council is at present.

In the Panel's judgment, the major advantages which this plan offers are as follows:

1. The competition between the State College system and the University, epitomized in the struggle over a change of name for the former, would be ended. The problem would no longer exist. State Colleges would be a part of the University. They

would enjoy its constitutional status, with the greater administrative freedom this would carry; they would have the same recruiting advantages which the University campuses enjoy; conditions of work and proposed new programs would be issues to be settled flexibly on their merits, campus by campus. Other advnatages of a university which presently impress State College faculties would be shared. The educational system as a whole, which is to say the people of California, would be spared the waste in time and resources which competition, friction, and duplication of effort between two major educational systems entails.

2. The organization of the State College and University campuses into one flexible system would encourage a new evaluation of the assets and potentialities of each institution to provide programs and services needed by the state. This is one of the thorniest elements of the present structure -- its seeming inability to modify in any way the programs and functions assigned by the Master Plan. It is this inability which in part produced the proposal to create a fourth public segment. The achievement of the flexibility possible under this alternative is one of the strong arguments for the regional plan of organization. The consolidated University would permit this

re-evaluation to be carried out with whatever gradualness might be desirable. This re-evaluation would include judgments concerning University campuses as well as present State Colleges.

3. Consolidation makes highly achievable regional cooperation and mutual assistance, especially between neighboring institutions. While the Junior Colleges would not be included in the consolidated University, there would be maximum statewide coordination within all the four-year and graduate public institutions, where the need for such close relationships is the greatest. The integration and flexibility thereby achieved are major values of this alternative. Cooperation, however, is most immediately useful and likely between neighboring institutions. A common administrative structure might be expected to produce substantial results in relationships between adjacent institutions such as San Jose State College and the Santa Cruz University Campus, Sacramento State and the Davis Campus of the University, U.C.L.A. and the colleges in the Los Angeles area. At this point the regional plan and the proposal to unite in one organization all of the senior institutions accomplish similar ends. Concern about the

omission of the Junior Colleges can be answered as follows: the achievement of coordination and cooperation is more important among those institutions which overlap for five or six years of the academic programs offered. Local relationships and responsibilities of the Junior Colleges constitute a sound reason for leaving them out of the consolidated University. (The possibility of including the Junior Colleges under the one governing board is considered under Alternative VI.)

4. There is a further advantage to be derived from this organization of all baccalaureate degree granting institutions as parts of a single institution. Higher education has entered a challenging period, one of growing misunderstanding and criticism on the part of the public, and one in which re-examination of goals, methods, and structures must take place. Higher education can ill afford in the years ahead the public effects of institutional rivalry and conflict. Without minimizing the great importance of the junior college system, nor the extent to which the people of the state will cherish and support it, this alternative creates an opportunity in the state for undivided loyalty to one great consolidated University, one which would bear one of the great names among the universities of the world. Criticism of the

consolidated University would continue, as will always be the case, but the issues would be uncomplicated by divided loyalties.

In brief, this alternative clearly simplifies the total educational structure. Responsibility for higher education above the lower division level would be clearly allocated. Capacity to carry out reforms would be strengthened. The approach to the Legislature would be clarified. A statewide system of great flexibility is created.

What, then, are the difficulties and the objections to this alternative? The following have been expressed by one or more persons:

1. There will always be the concern that this alternative places too much power in the hands of one board, namely that of the consolidated University. This same criticism could be raised against the idea of a board or council with regulatory powers (Alternative II) and, by the same token, against the Regional Plan (Alternative IV). Without denying that the consolidated University would be an unusually strong institution, one might comment that the state cannot have statewide coordination -- other than through the uncertainty of voluntary agreements -- without placing authority somewhere. In this instance, a

Board of Regents would be responsible for 28 centers. The Board of Governors currently being organized for the Junior Colleges will have partial authority over some 85 or 90 institutions.

2. Consolidation, it is argued, would mean a general process of leveling between all 28 institutions, with a gain in mediocrity for all. This could be the case, but there is no reason to think that it would occur. California has learned the value of distinction on the highest level, more especially through the accomplishments and reputations of the Berkeley and U.C.L.A. campuses. A governing board is not likely to forget this. An examination of what has followed in other states where only one governing board exists does not suggest such results. On the other hand, no system is viable which endeavors to make 28 institutions identical. California cannot afford 28 major universities, nor, equally, can it afford to lose the distinction of several of the University campuses. Consolidation of the two four-year segments would have to be accompanied by a new plan of program allocations, and to prepare such a plan would probably be the first duty of the reorganized governing board. Such a plan, presumably, would profit from the

experiences under the present Master Plan. The major lesson learned would be the absolute need for flexibility in organization and program under continued administrative review, rather than by legal classification.

3. Under such a consolidation, the State Colleges would, it could be argued, find themselves permanently assigned to lower levels of work and status. This point of view accepts the conclusion that flexibility and diversity would mark the systems, but fears that the former State College campuses might be the victims of it. The Panel doubts the validity of the word "permanently" in any case, and also whether the possibility would apply to all colleges equally. Three considerations seem relevant:

    a. There is strength in a number of State Colleges which cannot be overlooked.

    b. The governing board would be in a conspicuous position where unquestioned fairness and impartiality would be essential.

    c. It is assumed that the creation of the consolidated University would be accompanied by appropriate changes in the governing board.

4. This alternative, it is argued, would increase the costs of higher education by pushing up the salary levels of State College faculties to the level of that of the University, and by increasing other appropriations similarly. Quite possibly this is correct to some degree. However, a uniform salary schedule throughout all institutions, irrespective of function or special activities, does not seem necessarily implied. This question will need thorough study. In the long run genuine inequities where they exist will have to be eliminated under any plan of organization. The question of cost increases cannot be realistically dealt with without determining also the costs of alternative courses which might be followed. At this point one can only say that a uniform salary scale irrespective of task or function does not seem necessary.

5. The objection has been stated that 27 to 30 institutions are too many for a single board to manage, that the members of the board could not possibly be familiar with that many campuses, each with their separate problems. The individual institutions will also always feel remote from the source of power. These concerns may have some validity. The Board of Regents would need to be willing to confine its work totally to matters of policy, leaving administrative decisions to the officers and staff.

6. The administrative separation of the Junior Colleges from those of senior rank will be to some a serious drawback to this plan. This question, however, constitutes the core of Alternative VI and disucssion of the pros and cons of this will be found in that section of the report.

7. Some may object to this alternative because one or more constitutional amendments may be required to implement it. The Panel has taken the position that it should not fail to consider a proposal just because it does not fall within the area of present legal authorization. Furthermore, we understand some general amendments to the Constitution are now being considered which may handle these problems.

The discussion which follows, while possibly appearing to be a specific recommendation by the Panel, is not intended as such. An essential challenge in forming a consolidated University and in assuring its.accomplishment is determining the appropriate structure for its segmental governance under an advisory board or council.

It would be essential, in the Panel's judgment, that a Board of Regents with knowledge of the problems, needs and effectiveness of all the institutions be created to oversee the consolidated University. This would suggest an enlargement of the Board of Regents to include an equal number of members drawn from the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges. In order to accomplish this without too great an enlargement of the Board, and because the suggestion is in our opinion defensible on its merits, a second change is suggested -- the elimination of all _ex officio_ members from the Board of Regents. At present these constitute eight out of the 24 members of the Board. These are the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the President of the State Board of Agriculture, the President of the Mechanics Institute, the President of the Alumni Association, and the President of the University. The chief elected officials of the state have a major role in the affairs of higher education through their respective offices. Membership on the Board would seem to be unnecessary, and perhaps to require a public involvement in issues at too early a stage. They are, more than any others, the ones to whom University requests will be submitted. In the case of other _ex officio_ members, their services, which in some instances in recent years have been notable, have been due to personal qualities rather than to official positions. The President of the University administers the institution through the confidence of the Board in him. Membership on the Board might be desirable but a vote by him is unnecessary and, in fact, at times even awkward. The President of the Alumni

Association might be given the right to attend all meetings in an advisory relationship, without membership, a status presently granted certain individuals.

If these eight places were eliminated, the present Board of Regents would then have 16 places. If doubled by members appointed from the State College Board, it would not be unmanageable in size. Provision also could be made, if desired, for the Board to be reduced to 24 members over a period of years.

A third change, also generally urged by the Panel, is that the term of office be reduced from the present 16 years with the possibility of re-appointment to terms of eight to 12 years.

These changes in the governing board might make this plan more acceptable while at the same time, as stated, be justified on their merits.

To attempt a balanced summary of this alternative is difficult. It offers a number of positive advantages. It eliminates the competition and rivalry between the two segments for good and all. To be sure, there would still be competition between educational institutions, but it would be settled within the educational community through an established process. The plan holds a promise of a unified administration and a better integrated and cooperative system of senior colleges and graduate schools. The Coordinating Council is continued.

On the negative side, the major problems seem to be two: whether the state is prepared to rely upon the handling of the problem of differentiation of function and program among its senior institutions by administrative decisions, decisions which might be more flexible and more realistic than the requirements of the 1960 Master Plan, but less subject to legislative control; and, secondly, whether the assumption that the system in the long run will probably be at least as economical as the continuation of the separation of the two four-year segments is well founded.

ALTERNATIVE VI - A SINGLE BOARD FOR ALL PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

A system in which all public institutions of higher education -- University campuses, State Colleges and Junior Colleges -- would be under the governance of a single board or council. Under this alternative no additional coordinating mechanism would be necessary.

This arrangement is a variant of Alternative V. It achieves coordination throught a single governing board for all public higher education institutions. It offers many of the advantages and disadvantages of Alternative V and greatly increases the size of the consolidated University by adding to it all of the Junior Colleges.

The major advantages to the alternative, in the Panel's judgment, are the following:

1. Coordination is now made complete. In fact, coordination is no longer the word to use. All of public higher education will have become part of one statewide institution with over 100 campuses, since the organized segments would no longer exist. The rivalry between segments will disappear. Dissatisfactions and competition will continue to a degree, but such as exist will be confined to individual institutions rather than occuring between the large segments.

2. The entire scope of public higher education would be brought together administratively and channels for cooperation and coordination between the units opened. Failures in articulation and coordination will occur, but correction of the system's malfunctioning would be facilitated by unquestioned allocation of responsibility and clear lines of authority.

3. The plan brings together the two segments kept separate under Alternative V, namely, the Junior Colleges and the consolidated University. There are cogent arguments for not separating these institutions any more than may be necessary.

    a. The Junior Colleges, it is pointed out, grew out of the local public school systems but are colleges, breaking away from their secondary school backgrounds.

    b. Many junior college students will go to four-year colleges. Articulation, including agreements between junior and four-year colleges on equivalence of courses, is an important task.

    c. Junior Colleges are destined to play an increasingly important role in higher education. In California these colleges currently enroll 50 per cent of all full-time students in public institutions -- 64 per cent if part-time students are included -- with the policy of the state as expressed in the Master Plan to increase this percentage.

d. It must also be recognized that the traditional four-year liberal arts course is under heavy pressure from many quarters and a definite trend exists to shorten it to three years or even less. This is being done at present through various devices -- admission with advanced standing, seniors in absentia, etc. If the trend should continue and gain recognition, the B.A. degree becoming a three-year course, the relationships of four-year and Junior Colleges undoubtedly will be affected.

4. A concentration of leadership and responsibility, which in some respects and relationships would be useful, would be accomplished.

In the Panel's judgment, the chief objections to placing all public institutions of higher education in the state under one governing board are as follows:

1. There will always be fear of a single governing board, which will be felt even more strongly here in contrast to the objections under Alternative V. Instead of less than 30 institutions, the board would now be responsible for the governance of approximately 110 institutions. Furthermore, with the elimination of the Board of Governors for the Junior College system, and also of the Coordinating

Council -- which under this alternative would be left with nobody to coordinate -- there would be no countervailing organization to challenge the adequacy or effectiveness of the state's system of higher education.

2. Apart from fear of too much concentration of authority, is the simple argument that 110 institutions of higher education are simply too many for one board and one administrative organization to handle. The governing authorities, it is felt, would find themselves dealing with stereotypes rather than with the actual institutions, and the pressures for uniformity, simply for administrative convenience, would be strong.

3. There is reason to be concerned about weakening the relationships of the Junior Colleges to their local communities. The genius of the junior college -- or community college -- is response to local needs. Support in large part is locally supplied. The Junior Colleges may profit from educational association with four-year colleges, but remote control, especially in competition with four-year institutions, is felt to be another matter. It is important with the Junior Colleges to keep a proper balance of local responsibility and statewide authority. While under central statewide governance the local boards could continue, they would undoubtedly exist in a

weakened form.

4. Governance of the Junior Colleges by a central educational authority responsible for all of public higher education might mean more concern for students who plan to transfer to a four-year college on completion of their course, and less concern for students taking terminal programs ending their education with the Associate Degree. If this happened, the Junior Colleges would be weakened in respect to their unique and special service to the state, and changed in their basic character.

5. One educational structure, as proposed in this alternative, leaves little place for formal relationships with the private colleges and universities. While a voluntary association to exchange information and promote cooperation might be set up, it could hardly be counted on to contribute substantially to the maximum use of the state's total educational resources.

The arguments for this alternative are attractive in principle. Theoretically one governing board with full power over major operations of all institutions should give complete coordination. The question to be answered is whether coordination is the overriding concern, more important, that is, than good administration, for example, and the maintenance of the local relationships of the community colleges.

ALTERNATIVE VII - AN ENLARGED UNIVERSITY SEGMENT

A system consisting of three public segments - the University, the State Colleges, the Junior Colleges - coordinated by a board or council, with certain of the State Colleges transferred to the University.

This alternative is also a variant of Alternative V. Its purpose is to accommodate within the seemingly rigid assignments of program and function of the Master Plan of 1960 certain State Colleges with the proven potential for more advanced teaching and substantive research. This accommodation is achieved by simply transferring these institutions to the University of California. There is, of course, some question as to how many and which colleges would be transferred. San Francisco, San Jose, San Fernando Valley, Los Angeles, Long Beach and San Diego being the largest, are usually mentioned. Others might include Sacramento State, Fullerton State and Fresno.

In the Panel's judgment many of the advantages and disadvantages of this alternative are the same as those given for Alternative V. Therefore, this discussion largely compares this alternative positively and negatively with that of Alternative V.

1. Instead of 28 institutions within the consolidated University, there would now be only 15 to 18, depending on the number

of colleges transferred. The University would be free of the problems of some 10 to 13 colleges clearly not of university status, and a State College segment with its emphasis on undergraduate teaching would be preserved. The proposal thus incorporates the positive advantages of Alternative V without the necessity of transferring the least promising State Colleges to University status.

2. Which colleges are to be transferred presents a serious problem. If conservatively done -- and this is the genius of the proposal -- colleges almost good enough to qualify would be left within the State College system. The principle once established, however, of transfer on the basis of certain criteria would make it difficult to refuse to consider additional cases in the future. The question would constantly be under discussion.

3. The State College system would be left in a very weakened condition, having lost its strongest institutions. Also, the 10 to 13 smallest colleges left would continue to offer five years of academic work above the secondary school, thereby duplicating work being done within the University.

4. This alternative attempts to resolve the problem of the seeming rigidity or lack of flexibility of the Master Plan by new lists equally rigid. Colleges transferred will simply be moved into a new category. The flexibility in program and functional assignments noted as one of the major advantages of Alternative V would be lacking. Program development would still be determined in large part by legal classification.

5. As a variant of Alternative V, it offers a way of gradually achieving the consolidated University. Structurally it does appear to be a variant of Alternative V. In spirit and in terms of actual results, however, it might more accurately be said to be a variant of Alternative I, the present structure, since it leaves the educational system with the same segments, program assignments and functions as at present,and changes only the list of institutions comprising the two four-year segments. Alternative V is designed on a different principle--one of flexibility in assignment of educational functions and programs, undergraduate and graduate, within the consolidated University. Graduate programs would be assigned where they can be most successfully and economically pursued. Undergraduate programs would have the dignity and position of being an equally vital and indispensable function within the total consolidated University.

ALTERNATIVE VIII --GOVERNING BOARDS FOR EACH INSTITUTION

A system consisting of public institutions - University campuses, State Colleges, and Junior Colleges -- each governed locally by its own board and coordinated by a statewide board or council.

This alternative stresses the values of local responsibility, initiative, and support of colleges and universities, and, conversely, the difficulties of achieving effective statewide coordination with so many individual institutiona centers with their own governing boards.

This arrangement is similar to Alternative VI except for the high degree of local control. The statewide board or council would of necessity have to be a strong body with authority in specified areas over the some 110 institutions, each with its own governing board. The segmental organizations would of course cease to exist. It is assumed that the powers of the statewide council or board would be similar to those suggested under Alternative II, namely, review and control over new programs to avoid unnecessary duplication, review and approval of budget requests, recommendations concerning the establishment of new campuses, advice on problems of higher education to state officers and the Legislature, administration of Federal programs, and broad responsibility for orderly growth of the state's system of higher educa

The special advantages of this proposal derive, in the Panel's judgment, from the values of individual and local institutional autonomy, except in the areas specified, plus those values which might result from a strong coordinating central agency. For example:

1. Governance solely by a statewide agency is too removed and too general in character to provide the maximum of understanding and wise guidance for each of the public campuses of the state. Nor can such boards elicit the local support which can mean so much to an educational institution. The amount of time which the Board of Regents or the Board of Trustees currently are able to give to the problems of each campus under their direction is limited. The new Board of Governors of Junior Colleges will have less time for each of their colleges. In contrast, a board organized for a particular individual institution gives all of its attention to the problems of that particular campus. Proponents of this alternative would join advocates of the Regional Plan (Alternative IV) in maintaining that the gaps between the statewide central administrative offices and local institutions are too wide. This alternative corrects this situation by placing governance powers in the hands of each unit of higher education, rather than in the hands of a regional board.

2. The local boards would return to the respective institutions a sense of freedom, responsibility, and initiative. It is generally agreed that higher education is in need of reform in methods, curricula, and even, to some extent, in objectives. It is also argued that a great deal of diversity is desirable in higher education. To return a great deal of responsibility to the individual campus, freeing them from restraints, would contribute, it is maintainted, to this end.

3. Higher education is in need of public support to a greater extent than at any previous time. The proposed plan providing 110 or more governing boards, each concerned with the needs of an institution of higher education, would provide a constituency of 1800 to 2000 leading citizens on the state level, and, equally important, from 12 to 75 leaders on the local scene to espouse the cause of public support for higher education.

4. A council or board would be the only statewide agency for higher education. For reasons advanced earlier in this report, the board or council would be composed of leading citizens, not of educators, with the most competent staff

obtainable. It would state the case for and maintain the standards of education. Such a council or board would be in a strong position regarding the individual institutions because of its program and budgetary powers and responsibilities. It would be expected to exert strong leadership within the educational community, as well as with the public.

5. The plan presumably eliminates the tensions existing and increasing between State Colleges and the University. Each local institution under this plan would be on its own. To be sure, no plan or system can operate without recognizing distinctions of function and levels of work, in this case the authority presumably being in the statewide council or board. Objectives and complaints under this plan, however, would be those of particular campuses rather than organized into the massive protests of an entire segment.

Some of the limitations of this alternative are similar to those of other alternatives already discussed. There would also be numerous practical difficulties which this alternative might encounter. The Panel sees these major difficulties to be the following:

1. The reluctance of the educational establishment --and perhaps

others -- to place budgetary responsibility in the hands of a council or board, a reluctance the stronger in this case since the council or board would not be dealing with strongly entrenched segments but with individual institutions.

2. Independent administration of each institution sets up barriers to the exchange of faculty, crossing of institutional lines by students, shared use of facilities, and other cooperative activities. No doubt arrangements of this sort would be worked out, but endless negotiations would have to be carried through and agreements reached. The basic principle of "to each his own" would not encourage such activities.

3. There is the question of whether a council or board could competently handle the coordination of the budgets of 110 institutions, or to say it differently, to do so would require a very large staff. Knowledge of operations in other states suggests that the job could be done, but the staff would have to be large.

4. Many practical problems would arise from disbanding the present segmental organizations and setting up each institution

on an independent basis. The staff of each institution might have to be expanded. Officials appointed to positions under the present set of circumstances might not be adequate for broadened responsibilities. One could expect pressures to duplicate some facilities which previously might have been shared. Recruitment of faculty could become even more competitive and certainly more expensive.

5. The probability of difficulties between a board or council and the stronger institutions must be recognized. These institutions will have their own governing boards composed of men of distinction and influence. Adverse decisions of the council or board on matters felt to be important to these institutions could create serious problems of relationship and result in numerous political efforts to go around the board or council.

6. The likelihood of the enlistment of local political leaders in support of educational plans and ambitions would be always present. Local institutions desiring to move up in the world could hardly be expected not to seek all the assistance available. For a junior college seeking to become a four-year college to ask its local representatives in the capitol to help

> would be a natural thing to do. Most representatives would feel it their duty to their constituency to do all they could to further such developments. The most difficult problems would probably appear in connection with the major institutions, those with large budgets and enough prestige to endeavor to circumvent the power of a statewide council or board. This alternative's primary defect is that under its organization educational questions tend to take the form of local projects and plans rather than being matters related to state educational policy.

In summary, this alternative seems attractive chiefly in that it might eliminate a whole series of current problems -- the tensions between the segments, the present allocation of functions, the various strictures of the Master Plan, the uneasiness over the possibility of too much centralization of the governance of Junior Colleges, the inability of particular campuses at present to plead their cases before the Legislature, the limitations on growth of individual campuses, etc. But having done this, it supplies no effective answers to the problems which these several rules and policies were endeavoring to resolve. It differs from the Regional Plan (Alternative IV) only in that it carries governance all the way to the local institution and, therefore, loses some of the advantages for cooperation of that plan. Opinions will differ as to whether it is equally exposed to the dangers of political involvement in educational issues inherent in the Regional Plan. In general, the proposal moves against the national trend of higher education -- which in turn rests on strongly felt needs -- of establishing a pattern of working relationships between the scores of publicly supported institutions in the more populous states. While setting up a council or board for the purpose, it virtually returns to an earlier condition by opening the door to a great many institutional rivalries supported by boards of important local citizens with the enlistment of the local political leaders as an additional possible complication.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The preceding discussion seems, in the Panel's judgment, to reduce considerably the viable alternatives. Alternative III -- the development of a fourth segment -- is an addendum either to the present system or to Alternative II, a strengthened Coordinating Council. In the Panel's opinion, Alternative III lacks justification on its merits, and can be dropped from further consideration.

Alternative IV -- the proposal to set up regional university centers -- resolves a number of present problems and offers the possibility of genuine coordination within each designated region. The Panel does not believe that the problems of higher education can be effectively dealt with on a regional rather than a statewide basis, or that a board or council or a local voluntary regional group, which one form of this proposal could include, could coordinate effectively regional units possibly allied with strong local political forces. The Panel believes that the problems of public higher education should be dealt with on a statewide basis, the Junior Colleges being a partial exception.

The plan to place all 110 public institutions under a single board, namely, Alternative VI, with its possible weakening of the unique aspects and local relationships of the Junior Colleges and its probable overburdening of a central board and administration, does not, in the Panel's opinion, deal effectively with many of the key problems in California at this time.

Alternative VII -- the proposal to transfer an undetermined number of State Colleges to the University segment -- resolves one problem for the immediate future. It could be adopted as a part of Alternative I or II (the present system or the present system with increased statutory powers). It would still leave, however, two separate segments both granting the baccalaureate and master's degrees, and would greatly weaken one of them without supplying any constructive answer to the question of its future. The Panel believes that this proposal is an inadequate response to the problems facing higher education in California.

Alternative VIII -- the plan to dissolve the segmental organizations and return governance to each institution, with a single statewide board or council to relate and coordinate them -- does not commend itself to the Panel for the major reason stated in the text, namely, its lack of positive proposals for the coordinated development of the state's system of higher education.

On the basis of these judgments, Alternatives I, II and V remain. These are the present system, a council or board with specified authority, and the consolidated University and Junior Colleges coordinated by an advisory council or board.

A necessary first choice is between Alternatives I and II. While the Panel agrees that much can be said for "doing a better job with the system we have", the criticisms of the present system are so vigorous and widespread that some of these must be heeded and certain changes effected if the segment pattern in the main is to be continued. The two criticisms most frequently heard are that the Council should be made stronger, and that it should not be dominated by the three public segments. These considerations suggest a council with some authority, and a change in its membership to at least a majority of lay members. This arrangement is Alternative II.

Between Alternatives II and V the choice is difficult. Alternative II, the Council with certain statutory powers, has one serious lack -- it does not hold out the promise of resolving the tension and competition for funds between the two four-year segments. This problem has become a serious one, and except for the eternal problem of adequate finances, is the most serious one affecting higher education in California today. This alternative also does not offer much promise of solving the issue of particular State Colleges whose avenues of usefulness need re-examination.

Alternative V, the consolidation of the four-year public institutions offering baccalaureate, graduate and professional degrees into one system, would:

- provide a much needed opportunity for a review of each institution's best contributions to higher education;
- eliminate the existing rivalry between two strong four-year educational segments;
- bring together for appropriate allocation of functions and program two segments which now overlap for the greater part of their work;
- open the door for effective working relationships between contiguous institutions; and
- preserve the Coordinating Council as an independent body to perform various duties and to exercise a critical and advisory role.

The plan simplifies the present structure, avoids an additional step in budgeting, and frees the Council from the task of constantly policing program changes, enabling it to be concerned with the more important issues of the adequacy, balance and social responsiveness of California's system of higher education.

On substantive grounds, the Panel's recommendation would be Alternative V. There is, however, one further problem. Alternative II could possibly be put into operation by a simple act of the Legislature amending the Donahoe Act. Presumably it would not require a constitutional amendment. Alternative V -- specifically any changes which might be requested in the regulations concerning the Board of Regents -- would possibly require an amendment to the State Constitution. It is not the Panel's task, however, to pass upon the legal or the political feasibility of doing this. We can only say that, in our judgment, the easier choice (Alternative II) may not be the better one (Alternative V).

With respect to Alternative V, the Panel has a number of observations concerning the effectiveness of this alternative in dealing with the higher education problems in California which were cited earlier in the report (see page 14):

1. Financial support: Alternative V calls for two budgets, one for the consolidated University, one for the Junior Colleges, each in a distinct educational area. The financial advisory and recommending structure is simpler since the responsibilities between the two segments are clearly indicated.

2. Public understanding: This should be greatly improved by the elimination of exaggerated criticisms and claims by friends or proponents of the two four-year segments being consolidated.

Discussions in the Council and elsewhere would be concerned to a greater degree with what should be done rather than who should do it.

3. Proper allocation of decision-making responsibility: The increased number of campuses in the consolidated University and the large number of Junior Colleges will necessitate the assignment of administrative responsibility to the proper officers, the two Boards dealing with matters of policy and top appointments. Consolidation of two segments will reduce the number of issues presently to be decided necessarily by the Legislature.

4. Role of stronger State Colleges: Arbitrary barriers to development are ended, since decisions would be made by educational officers on their judgment of the merits of each case and the extent of funds available.

5. Dissatisfaction and protest over seeming rigidity of Master Plan: The problem disappears, though there will continue to be differences in programs to be carried out. Allocation of programs and functions are achieved on a campus by campus basis within the consolidated University.

6. Support and control of the Junior Colleges: The Coordinating Council will be in a position to study this problem and to make additional recommendations.

7. Greater cooperation and coordination: This will be achieved to a higher degree than under other alternatives. The Coordinating Council will be in a position to participate in problems of articulation between the two segments to the extent that this is necessary.

8. Educational Leadership: This would be encouraged because of the public interest motivating the Coordinating Council and the great strength derived from the consolidation of the State Colleges and Universities.

As noted earlier in this report, the Panel developed as background for its analysis of the various alternatives a list of general criteria (see page 10). These criteria served primarily to provide a framework within which the over-all analysis was made. However, for the purpose of further clarifying the unique advantages of Alternative V, the Panel notes the following with respect to Alternative V and these general criteria:

1. Efficient use of public funds: Performance should be good. Differentiation of programs between the campuses of the consolidated University can be assumed. Duplication of programs, particularly on the master's level, can be decisively dealt with. The Coordinating Council would be in a position to review and appraise program development and to identify unmet needs.

2. Orderly growth: The Coordinating Council, with lay membership, would be in a stronger position than at present, and with a less complicated task. Closer working relationships and adequate differentiation of function among the four-year campuses should minimize the need for new four-year campuses.

3. Cooperative activities: These should be greatly facilitated and strengthened, not only among the public institutions but between them and the private ones as well.

4. Appropriate opportunity for all: Concern for this would be a responsibility of the Coordinating Council. Relieved of major problems of program overlap, it should have time and attention for more general problems.

5. Useful institutional diversity: Continuation of the local ties of Junior Colleges which this alternative provides should contribute on this level. In the consolidated University the spirit and character of the administration would be decisive. Assignment of programs and functions would be achieved on a campus by campus basis.

6. Articulation: Consolidation of baccalaureate degree and graduate degree programs under a single central segmental administration, with the resulting differentiation of function and program, should improve the articulation with schools. Between Junior Colleges and baccalaureate degree programs, problems of articulation would be a responsibility of the Coordinating Council. The Junior Colleges, already close to the schools of their respective areas, would be expected to enroll a higher percentage of first time students than is now the case.

7. Quality in education: By consolidating the two segments under the administrative responsibility of the older and most distinguished component, quality standards should be maintained and forwarded. Each campus in the system would be a factor in the reputation of the University of California.

8. Educational leadership: Consolidation of the State Colleges and the University should improve greatly the management and decision making arrangements for the baccalaureate and higher degree programs. The Council would be concerned essentially with relating two segments with clearer areas of responsibility and function for each.

9. Legislative acceptance: The elimination of segmental competition, the clear separation of functions and programs between two segments, the promise of more efficient management arrangements, and the assurance of close working relationships on the regional level should make this alternative very acceptable.

10. Adaptability to social and political change: Adaptability would be increased in at least two respects -- through lay membership on the Council and through shorter terms for members of the Board of Regents. For the Junior Colleges, the local boards assure adaptability to local changes. The use of local advisory boards for the various campuses would help also in this regard.

11. Faculty and student participation: The plan does not of itself specifically provide for this, but there is room within the

alternative for faculty and student advisory committees for the Coordinating Council, for the respective governing boards, and at the local campus level.

12. Public understanding: The eliminating of claims and criticisms which accompany a competitive situation should contribute to a clearer understanding of the problems and needs of higher education.

13. Administration of Federal programs: This alternative provides adequate arrangements for this purpose. The Council could continue to handle certain programs. The University will be in even a stronger position to handle others under the new arrangement.

14. Advice and planning: The Coordinating Council would be free to perform this function, largely through or on the advice of its professional staff.

Whichever plan is adopted, an integral part of its implementation should be, in the Panel's judgment, the development of regional committees or commissions to further cooperation and mutual assistance among institutions of higher education of each region. Furthermore, the establishment of local advisory boards, advisory committees or boards of visitors for each of the four-year campuses, to give them a closer contact with the problems and needs of their immediate surroundings, should be strongly encouraged.